

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Sacramento)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JEFFREY CAMPBELL,

Defendant and Appellant.

C067677

(Super. Ct. No.
09F03843)

A jury convicted defendant Jeffrey Campbell of second degree murder and found true the allegation that he used a deadly weapon in committing the offense. (Pen. Code, §§ 187, subd. (a), 12022, subd. (b)(1).)¹ In a bifurcated proceeding, the trial court found that defendant was in violation of probation in a prior case involving a conviction for petty theft with a prior conviction.

¹ Further undesignated section references are to the Penal Code.

The trial court sentenced defendant to an aggregate state prison term of 16 years to life (one year for the deadly weapon enhancement and 15 years to life for murder).² The court awarded 666 actual days of presentence custody credit. The court imposed a \$10,000 restitution fine (\$ 1202.4, subd. (b)), a \$10,000 suspended restitution fine (\$ 1202.45), a \$40 court security fee (\$ 1465.8, subd. (a)(1)), a \$30 court facility fee (Gov. Code, § 70373), a \$263.85 main jail booking fee (Gov. Code, § 29550.2), and a \$28.75 main jail classification fee (Gov. Code, § 29550.2). The court also awarded victim restitution in the amount of \$7,504.63.

According to the evidence at trial, defendant, a drug addict, fatally stabbed Frederick Howard, his dealer, in the early morning hours of May 19, 2009. The prosecution claimed that defendant killed Howard to avoid paying a \$100 debt and to steal Howard's money and drugs. Defendant testified that he killed Howard in self-defense after wresting away the knife Howard pulled on him.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and requests this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel

² In case No. 07F05412 (the probation case), the court imposed a two-year concurrent sentence, as well as probation revocation and parole revocation fines of \$200 each.

of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed, and we received no communication from defendant. Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NICHOLSON, J.

We concur:

RAYE, P. J.

DUARTE, J.